



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,383	03/26/2004	Mathias Sonneck	07781.0160-00	7611
60668 7590 08/26/2010 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
BAIRD, EDWARD J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3695				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/26/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,383

Applicant(s)

SONNEK ET AL.

Examiner

Ed Baird

Art Unit

3695

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on **03 June 2010** has been entered.

Status of Claims

2. Applicant has amended claims **1, 9, 17 and 25**. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 6, 14, 22 and 26 were canceled prior to last office action. Thus, claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-25, 27, and 28 remain pending and are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's remarks/ arguments filed **03 June 2010** have been fully considered.
4. Examiner acknowledges amendments to **claim 9** to overcome 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph rejections of claims 9-13, 15 and 16 (noted as 9-16) and, in turn, withdraws rejection.
5. Applicant's arguments filed regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections and *prima facie* case of obviousness [Remarks page 14, 2nd paragraph to page 15, 1st full paragraph] have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references [Remarks page 14, 3rd paragraph to page 15, 1st full paragraph and page 18, 1st paragraph], the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where

there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, both **Jones** and **Brown** disclose managing investment portfolios [**Jones** Abstract and **Brown** Abstract] and **Fickes** discloses a system and method for defining the value of a corporation by its categories of values, and determining the risk profile of the corporation [Abstract]. **Adhikari** also evaluates business valuations [Abstract]. Each reference is clearly related to valuating assets (securities) as is the instant invention.

7. Applicant argues **Jones** does not teach *displaying advice regarding the balance sheet objects on a display* [Remarks page 15, 2nd full paragraph]. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner notes that **Jones** [column 17 lines 44-62] was cited as teaching "presenting advise for a degree to which the conditions are satisfied" [Final OA mailed 09 March 2010 – page 3 and 4]. In addition, **Jones** discloses:

At step 840, advice processing is performed. According to one embodiment of the present invention, based upon the user's preference among the decision variables, the system may offer advice regarding which decision variable should be modified to bring the portfolio back on track to reach the one or more financial goals with the desired probability. In addition, the system may recommend a reallocation to improve efficiency of the portfolio. An alert may be generated to notify the user of the advice and/or need for affirmative action on his/her part. As described above, the alert may be displayed during a subsequent user session with the financial advisory system 100 and/or the alerts may be transmitted immediately to the user by telephone, fax, email, pager, fax, or similar messaging system [column 28 lines 24-37].

Examiner notes that *offering advice* and *displaying an alert* is indicative to Applicant's *displaying advice regarding the balance sheet objects on a display*.

8. Examiner notes that arguments regarding "degree to which the conditions are satisfied" [Remarks page 16, 2nd paragraph to page 17, 2nd paragraph, and page 18, 2nd paragraph to top of page 19] are moot in light of new 112, second paragraph rejections.

9. Applicant's disputes that Examiner has not adequately traversed the reliance on **Official Notice** [Remarks page 13, last paragraph and page 19, bottom of page to page 21].

Specifically, Applicant cites Amendment, filed December 18, 2009, p. 22, and that "Official Notice was and is improper at least because no evidence has been provided that demonstrates a *prima facie* case of obviousness" [Remarks page 20, 1st full paragraph]. Although Examiner disagrees with Applicant, the point is moot based on new grounds of rejection.

Claim Objections

10. **Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, 25 and 27** are objected to because of the following informalities:

The terms "presettable conditions", "presettable value", "presettable amount" and "settable period of time" are vague and indefinite. Examiner believes Applicant means "*preset* conditions", "a *preset* value", "*preset* amount" and "*set* period of time".

For purposes of examination, the terms will be interpreted accordingly. Appropriate correction is required.

11. **Claim 1** is objected to because the method steps indicate that they are each performed "by a processor". It is not clear to the Examiner whether they are performed by the same processor or different processors.

For purposes of examination, the term "by a processor" will be interpreted to mean by the same processor. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
14. Regarding **claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, 25 and 27**, the terms "presettable conditions", "presettable value", "presettable amount" and "settable period of time" are vague and indefinite. Examiner believes Applicant means "*preset* conditions", "*a preset* value", "*preset* amount" and "*set* period of time".

For purposes of examination, the terms will be interpreted accordingly. Appropriate correction is required.

15. Regarding **claims 1, 9, 17 and 25**, in the limitations:

- automatically performing, by a processor, one or more actions depending upon *the manner or degree to which* one or more of the presettable conditions are satisfied; *and*
- displaying advice regarding the balance sheet objects on a display, the advice being based on the manner or degree to which the conditions are satisfied;

the term "depending upon/ based on the manner or degree to which one or more of the presettable [sic] conditions are satisfied" is vague and indefinite. Manner and degree are not parameters in whether or not a condition is satisfied.

For purposes of examination, the term limitations will be interpreted to read:

- automatically performing, by a processor, one or more actions depending upon *whether or not* one or more of the preset conditions are satisfied; *and*

- displaying advice regarding the balance sheet objects on a display, the advice being based on *whether or not* the *preset* conditions are satisfied.

Appropriate correction is required.

16. Regarding **claims 1, 9, 17 and 25**, in the limitations:

- sending a message to a person containing information about *the specific condition in question*;

the term “the specific condition in question” lacks antecedent basis. For purposes of examination, the term will be interpreted to read “a preset condition”. Appropriate correction is required.

17. **Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 27, and 28** are rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

18. Regarding **claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24**, the limitations:

- the calculated impairment price is a market price for the object; *and*
- the calculated impairment price is a market price for the object increased or reduced by a presettable value.

require that the impairment price is calculated in the claim upon which each depends. However, if the impairment price is not calculated in the claim upon which each depends; there is a lack of antecedent basis for “the impairment price”.

For purposes of examination, the term “the impairment price” will be interpreted to read “an impairment price”. Appropriate correction is required.

19. Regarding **claim 25**, the limitation:

- wherein automatically forming the intermediate variable from the book value and the market value further comprises automatically calculating, by a processor, an intermediate variable;

does not make sense in that forming the intermediate value comprises calculating an intermediate value. It is not clear to the Examiner what the difference is between the intermediate value and an intermediate value.

For purposes of examination, the above limitation will be interpreted to be not further limiting. Appropriate correction is required.

20. Regarding **claim 25**, the limitations:

- automatically testing, by a processor, the intermediate variable to determine whether it satisfies one or more presettable conditions;
- wherein automatically testing the intermediate variable to determine whether it satisfies one or more presettable conditions is testing the disparity between the intermediate variable and an average value for the intermediate variable ascertained over a settable period of time, by a presettable amount.

are vague and indefinite in as much as the second limitation further limits the first limitation but is disconnected from it. Also, it is not clear in the second limitation whether the intermediate value is tested for satisfying a preset condition or an average intermediate value is tested for satisfying a preset condition.

For purposes of examination, the limitations will be interpreted as:

- automatically testing, by a processor, the intermediate variable to determine whether it satisfies one or more preset conditions - (*no change*);
- automatically testing the average intermediate variable over a set period of time, to determine whether it satisfies one or more preset conditions over a preset amount.

Appropriate correction is required.

21. Regarding **claim 27**, the limitation:

- wherein displaying a calculated impairment price comprises drawing attention to the manner and degree to which the presettable [sic] conditions are satisfied by means of a screen icon.

is vague and indefinite. The concept of "drawing attention" is vague because it does not decisively state what function is being performed; the metes and bounds of the claim are not clearly set out. Also, the "manner and degree" are not parameters in whether or not a condition is satisfied

For the purposes of examination, the limitation will be interpreted as:

- wherein displaying a calculated impairment price comprises using a screen icon.

Appropriate correction is required.

22. Art rejections below are made with respect to 112, second paragraph rejections above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claim 1-5, 9-13, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brown et al** (US Pub. No. 2002/0059127) in view of **Jones et al** (US Patent. No. 7,016,870).

25. Regarding **claim 1**, **Brown** teaches:

- automatically ascertaining, by a processor, a book value for each object in an accounting system [see at least 0018 and 0031. Examiner interprets *cost basis or then present value of each individual security* as analogous to Applicant's *book value*. Examiner notes that because rebalancing, tax loss harvesting, and trading functions are performed automatically by computerized systems [0018], automatically *ascertaining* the book value is inherent in his method].

- automatically determining, by a processor, a market value for each object [0033].
- automatically forming, by a processor, an intermediate variable from the book value and the market value [0033]. Examiner interprets *current index value* as analogous to Applicant's *intermediate variable*.

- automatically testing, by a processor, the intermediate variable to determine whether it satisfies one or more preset conditions [0042 and 0043]. Examiner interprets *tax loss harvesting process* as including Applicant's *automatically testing the intermediate variable*; and

Brown does not explicitly disclose:

- displaying advice regarding the balance sheet objects on a display, the advice being based on whether or not the preset conditions are satisfied.

However, **Jones** discloses a financial advisory system which produces forecasts for financial advisory services [column 3 lines 40-57]. He further discloses the financial advisory system which provides an *initial diagnosis* based upon the user's risk preference, savings rate, and desired risk-return tradeoffs [column 6 lines 38-44].

Jones discloses recommending portfolio allocations [column 17 lines 44-62] and recommending a fixed target asset-mix [column 19 lines 10-18] as well as other investment mix/

balancing strategies throughout. He further discloses displaying information to a user [column 7 line 56 – column 8 line 2] and alerts to notify users of advice transmitted immediately to the user by telephone, fax, email, pager, fax, or similar *messaging* system [column 28 lines 24 – 37]. He further discloses *offering advice, displaying an alert* and *recommending reallocation* to improve portfolio performance [column 28 lines 24-37]. Examiner interprets *advice, alerts, and need for affirmative action* as indicative of Applicant's *displaying before (emphasis added) a sale or purchase of each object*. Examiner notes that *advice* by its nature only makes sense if it is offered prior to performing an action (herein, rebalancing a portfolio).

Further, **Jones** discloses *generating portfolio scenarios* and *recommendations* thereof and *exposure to asset classes* [column 4 lines 18-44]. Examiner interprets such *recommendations* as indicative of Applicant's *whether or not the preset conditions are satisfied*.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify **Brown's** invention to include *initial diagnosis of a portfolio* as taught by **Jones** because the diagnosis can result in a series of suggested actions including rebalancing the portfolio, increasing savings, retiring later, or adjusting investment risk [**Jones** column 6 lines 38-44].

26. Regarding **claims 2, 10, and 18**, **Brown** teaches balance sheet objects as securities [see at least 0013 to 0017].

27. Regarding **claims 3, 11, and 19**, **Brown** teaches the market value as the price of the object multiplied by the number of units available [see at least 0041 to 0043].

28. Regarding **claims 4, 12, and 20**, **Brown** teaches the intermediate variable as a difference between the book value and the market value [see at least 0034]. Examiner interprets the difference between *the present market value* and *the stored historical cost value* as analogous to Applicant's *intermediate variable*.

29. Regarding **claims 5, 13, and 21**, **Brown** teaches preset condition as the disparity between the intermediate value and a maximum disparity for the intermediate variable [see at least 0034] - Examiner interprets *predetermined loss threshold* as analogous to Applicant's *maximum disparity for the intermediate variable*; - ascertained over a set period of time by a preset amount [see at least 0041].

30. **Claims 9 and 17** are a system claim and an apparatus claim, respectively, substantially similar to the method of claim 1, and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

31. Claim 7, 8, 15, 16, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Brown** in view **Jones** in further view of **Fickes** (US Pub. No. 2005/0262014).

32. Regarding **claims 7, 15 and 23**, **Brown** teaches a calculated impairment price as a market price for the object [see at least 0034]. Examiner interprets *present market value of each security* as analogous to Applicant's *impairment price*. However, neither **Brown** nor **Jones** explicitly discloses displaying such prices.

However, **Fickes** discloses a system and method for defining values of corporations by its categories of values, and determining risk profiles accordingly [Abstract]. These values include Category I -- Current Realizable Value, Category II -- Value of Existing Business, Category III -- Infrastructure Value, and Category IV -- Venture Value. Categories II through IV represent values over (or under) Category I [see at least 0073 to 0081]. **Fickes** further discloses displaying values of the "metrics" for a company [see at least 0134]. Examiner interprets these *metrics* are being inclusive of Applicant's *calculated impairment price* as a market price (*Category I -- Current Realizable Value*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Brown's** invention to include *displaying a calculated impairment price as a market*

price as taught by **Fickes** because it allows a user to the user to build a logical set of criteria for defining a peer group by specifying [sic] lower and upper boundaries for any number of metrics [**Fickes** 0133].

33. Regarding **claims 8, 16 and 24**, neither **Brown** nor **Jones** explicitly discloses a calculated impairment price as a market price for the object increased or reduced by a presettable value, and neither discloses displaying a calculated impairment price (from claim 1).

However, **Fickes** discloses a system and method for defining values of corporations by its categories of values, and determining risk profiles accordingly [Abstract]. These values include Category I -- Current Realizable Value, Category II -- Value of Existing Business, Category III -- Infrastructure Value, and Category IV --Venture Value. Categories II through IV represent values over (or under) Category I [see at least 0073 to 0081]. **Fickes** further discloses displaying values of the "metrics" for a company [see at least 0134]. Examiner interprets these *metrics* are being inclusive of Applicant's *impairment price* as a market price for the object increased or reduced by a presettable value as in *Categories II through IV* discussed herein.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Brown's** invention to include *displaying a calculated impairment price as a market price for the object increased or reduced by a presettable value* as taught by **Fickes** because it allows a user to the user to build a logical set of criteria for defining a peer group by specifying [sic] lower and upper boundaries for any number of metrics [**Fickes** 0133].

34. Regarding **claim 25**, **Brown** teaches:

- automatically ascertaining, by a processor, a book value for each object in an accounting system;
- automatically determining, by a processor, a market value for each object;

- automatically forming, by a processor, an intermediate variable from the book value and the market value;
- automatically testing, by a processor, *an* intermediate variable to determine whether it satisfies one or more presettable
as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. **Brown** also teaches:
 - automatically testing the average intermediate variable . . . , to determine whether it satisfies one or more preset conditions [see at least 0033 and 0034]. Examiner interprets *stored historic cost value* as analogous to Applicant's *average intermediate variable*.
 - . . . over a set period of time . . . over a preset amount [see at least 0032 to 0034]. Examiner interprets *predetermined loss threshold* as analogous to Applicant's *preset amount*.

Neither **Brown** nor **Jones** explicitly discloses:

- displaying a calculated impairment price.

However, **Fickes** discloses a system and method for defining values of corporations by its categories of values, and determining risk profiles accordingly [Abstract]. These values include Category I -- Current Realizable Value, Category II -- Value of Existing Business, Category III -- Infrastructure Value, and Category IV -- Venture Value. Categories II through IV represent values over (or under) Category I [see at least 0073 to 0081]. **Fickes** further discloses displaying values of the "metrics" for a company [00134]. Examiner interprets these *metrics* are being inclusive of Applicant's *impairment price*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Brown's** invention to include *displaying an impairment price* as taught by **Fickes** because it allows a user to build a logical set of criteria for defining a peer group by specifying [sic] lower and upper boundaries for any number of metrics [**Fickes** 0133].

35. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Brown** in view of **Jones** in further view of **Fickes** in further view of **Adhikari** (US Pub. No. 2004/0158479).

36. Regarding claim 27, neither **Brown**, **Jones**, nor **Fickes** explicitly disclose:

- wherein displaying a calculated impairment price comprises using a screen icon.

However, **Adhikari** discloses methods and systems for calculating business valuations and using iterative processes to generate a maximum business value based on conditions and requirements of interested parties [0002]. He further discloses the use of a “best value” *icon* which generates and displays an optimized value representing required Buyer Equity [see at least 0060, 0069, 0076, and 0083]. Examiner interprets *Buyer Equity* as analogous to Applicant’s *impairment price*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Brown’s** invention to include *using a “best value” icon to generate and display optimized values* as taught by **Adhikari** because it allows a user maximum versatility in determining the factors most critical to a transaction and in calculating the best value of part of a transaction [**Adhikari** 0086].

37. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Brown** in view of **Jones** in further view of **Fickes** in further view of **Adhikari** and **Kumar et al** (US Pub. No. 2002/0019810).

38. Regarding claim 28, neither **Brown**, **Fickes**, or **Adhikari** explicitly discloses displaying the difference between an amortized acquisition value of the object and an impairment value of the object.

However, **Fickes** discloses determining *Category I, II, III, and IV values* [see at least 0073 to 0082] and displaying related “metric” values [00134]. **Fickes** defines Category III - -

Infrastructure values are defined as "the discounted value of expected future cash flows from business which can reasonably be expected to be produced in future years, from new sales" [0079]. Examiner interprets this "*discounted value*" as analogous to Applicant's *amortized acquisition value*.

Fickes does not explicitly disclose the "*difference*" between the (amortized) acquisition value and an impairment value of the object. However, **Kumar** discloses a system for updating parameters of financial transactions associated with financial services [0021]. He further discloses an account display window listing the *purchased price* and the *current value* of each commodity owned [0256]. Examiner interprets *purchased price* as analogous to Applicant's acquisition value and *current value* as analogous to Applicant's *impairment value*. Examiner notes Applicant's definition of *impairment value* in instant specification [077].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify **Brown's** disclosure to include *displaying the purchased price and the current value of a commodity* as taught by **Kumar** because a user's cumulative gain or loss presented in both dollar value and percentage can be seen [**Kumar** 00257].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ed Baird whose telephone number is (571)270-3330. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 am - 5:00 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles R. Kyle can be reached on 571-272-6746. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ed Baird/
Examiner, Art Unit 3695

/Charles R. Kyle/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3695